

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

SIMBI KESIYI WABOTE,
Plaintiff,

v.

JACKSON UDE,
Defendant.

:
:
:
:
:
:
:

No. 5:21-cv-2214

ORDER

AND NOW, this 27th day of January 2022, upon consideration of Defendant's letter-request, *see* ECF No. 99, asking the Court to reconsider its Order dated January 20, 2022, *see* ECF No. 98, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

Defendant's letter-request, ECF No.'s. 99, is **DENIED**.¹

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joseph F. Leeson, Jr.

JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR.

United States District Judge

¹ The Court denies Ude's letter-request to reconsider because he has not shown an intervening change in the law, the availability of new evidence that was not available when the Court issued its Order dated January 20, 2022, *see* ECF No. 98, or the need to clear error of law or fact to prevent manifest injustice. *See Max's Seafood Café ex rel. Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros*, 176 F. 3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999).

Contrary to Defendant's assumption, the Court did not deny Defendant's prior requests (ECF No's. 90 and 91) for technical reasons only. The Court denied his request for sanctions after it considered the merits of the parties' letter-briefs and oral arguments. *See Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.*, 501 U.S. 32, 44–45 (1991) (explaining that district courts have the inherent power to decide whether sanctions are imposed or not).